

REMARKS

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-6, and 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Eck (4586768).

Regarding U.S. Patent No. 4,586,768, Eck discloses an electrical connector comprising a plug 2 having a cover 4, a cable 8 electrically connected to the plug 2 and a belt 14 attached to the plug 2 by the cover 4. The cover 4 has an interior space defined by a cover top 21, parallel side walls 20, 22 and inwardly facing ledges 24, 26. The cable 8 has a plurality of wires 6 connected to electrical connections 16 within grooves 18 positioned across an end face of the plug 2. The belt 14 has a plurality of teeth 28. Thus, ***when the cover 4 is snapped in the plug 2, the belt 14 is retained beneath the cover 4 with the teeth 28 mashing with the grooves 18 for assisting in retaining ends of wires 6 against the electrical connections 16.*** As shown in FIG. 3, the belt 14 is located between the cover 4 and the plug 2 and depresses the cable 8. It is clear that the cover 4 cannot engage with the cable 8.

Regarding claim 1 of the prevent invention, a cable end connector assembly comprises an insulative housing, a plurality of contacts received in the housing, a cable electrically terminated with the contacts, an insulative cover assembled to the housing and a pull tab assembled to the cover. ***The cover has a first face engaging with the cable and a second face opposite to the first face wrapped by the pull tab.***

Apparently, the prevent invention provides the cover engaging with the cable and at the same time wrapped by the pull tab which is unreachable by the prior art. This is because the belt 14 in Eck directly depresses the wires 6 of the cable 8.

Therefore, Eck cannot anticipate claim 1 of the prevent invention and claim 1 should be allowable. Dependent claims 2-5, 8 cannot anticipate and should also be allowable since they depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1.

Additionally, claim 2 clearly defines the cover having a pair of ribs and the pull tab engaging with the ribs which is also unreachable by the prior art. In fact, referring to FIG. 2 in Eck, the cover 4 has a pair of inwardly facing ledges 24, 26 for abutting against bottom surfaces of the T-cross section. The inwardly facing ledges 24, 26 are incapable of directly engage with the belt 14.

More, claim 3 further defines each rib defining a slot and the pull tab extending through the slots to enclose the ribs. By contrast, the cover 4 of Eck fails to form any rib to defining slot for the extension of the belt. And in Eck the interior space is defined by the cover top 21, the side walls 20, 22 and the ledges 24, 26 for receiving the belt 14 therein. As disclosed above, the belt 14 extends through the interior space incapable of engaging with, saying nothing of, enclosing the ledges 24, 26.

Similarly, claim 9 of the prevent invention also clearly defines the cover by stating *"a first face engaging with the cable"*. In addition, claim 9 further clearly defines a pulling section formed on the cover and extended through by the pull tab. This is an important feature of the invention but Eck does not disclose it.

Therefore, Eck cannot anticipate claim 9 of the prevent invention and claim 9 should be allowable. Dependent claims 10-11 cannot anticipate and should also be allowable since they are depended, directly or indirectly, from claim 9.

Claim 12 of the prevent invention defines the cover cooperating with the housing to retain the cable therebetween, the pulling section formed along the cover and the pull tab located above the cover. However, the belt 14 in Eck is retained beneath the cover 4 with the teeth 28 meshing with the grooves 18 for assisting in retaining ends of wires 6 which is very different from the prevent invention.

In addition, claim 12 defines a pair of laterally projecting pulling sections along two opposite elongated edges of the cover along the lengthwise direction, while in opposite Eck only shows the longitudinally projecting pull sections at the opposite lengthwise ends along the edges in the lateral direction.

Moreover, claim 12 defines the upward force applied ONLY on the pulling sections, while in Eck all the portions of the belt (14) under the cover (4) apply the upward force upon the whole underside of the cover (4).

Therefore, Eck cannot anticipate claim 12 of the prevent invention. Amended claim 12 should be allowable. Dependent claim 13 cannot anticipate and should also be allowable because of not only its dependency upon claim 12 but also its limitations of "the pulling section extending through the elongated slot which is arranged in the lengthwise direction". Claim 15 defines the two lower sections being rejoined after extending through the slots while Eck lacks it. Claim 16 defines a lateral loop configuration while Eck shows a longitudinal loop

configuration. Thus, claims 15 and 16 also have their own novelties other than their dependencies.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eck.

Claim 7 depends from amended claim 1 and further defined that a guiding post extends from one end of the base of the housing and adapted for engaging with a complementary connector.

Similar to foregoing reason, claim 1 of the prevent invention provides the cover engaging with the cable and at the same time wrapped by the pull tab which is unreachable by the prior art. In light of this, one having ordinary skill in the art modifying the plug 2 of Eck to provide a guiding post as stated by Examiner can **NOT** obtain the subject matter as defined in claim 7 of the prevent invention.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Eck, so is Claim 7 which is directly depended from the claim 1.

In addition, application adds new claim 14 depended from the claim 1 by stating "the cover engages with the cable as well as engages the pull tab". Without adding new matter, because the claim 1 of the prevent invention has adequately disclosed. More importantly, this is an important feature of the prevent invention but Eck is unreachable.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the prevent invention is

believed to be in a condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Jerry Wu

By 

Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325

Foxconn International, Inc.

P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (408) 919-6137